

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

7 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

8 ESCO CORP. et al., )

9 Plaintiffs, )

10 vs. )

11 CASHMAN EQUIPMENT CO. et al., )

12 Defendants. )

2:12-cv-01545-RCJ-NJK

13 **ORDER**

14 Upon Defendant's motion, the Court transferred this case to the Central District of Illinois  
15 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) and ordered the Clerk to close the case in this District. The  
16 Clerk of the transferee district docketed the case on September 5, 2013 at 9:24 a.m. central time,  
17 (*see* ECF No. 87 in Case No. 1:13-cv-01409 (N.D. Ill.)), depriving this Court of further  
18 jurisdiction over the case, *see Lou v. Belzberg*, 834 F.2d 730, 733 (9th Cir. 1987). At 7:20 p.m.  
19 pacific time (9:20 p.m. central time) that day, Plaintiff asked this Court to reconsider transfer.  
20 The Court has no jurisdiction to reconsider.

21 Plaintiffs argue that the Court retains jurisdiction to reconsider the order because they ask  
22 the Court not only to reconsider the propriety of the transfer as a discretionary matter but the  
23 Court's power to transfer the case at all, because the present case, according to Plaintiff, could  
24 not have been brought in the transferee district, i.e., the Central District of Illinois, in the first  
25 instance. The Court declines to reconsider its analysis to the contrary in the previous order:

